

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 29 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 2-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19 and 21-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 18 and 20 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-13 of USPN 6,778,168.

Any rejection based on double patenting as between an application and patent must include a determination as to whether issuance of the application would provide unjustified extension of the term of the right to exclude granted by a patent. Issuance of the present application would not provide such an extension of the term. The priority date of the present application is 11/30/1999 and the filing date is 11/29/2000. The priority date of USPN 6,778,168 is 2/14/2000 and the filing date is 2/14/2001. Therefore, issuance of the present application would not result in an extension of the term. Thus, double patenting is not believed to be applicable as between USPN 6,778, 168 and the present application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,771). The Examiner stated essentially that Furuhashi teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 25-29.

Claim 25 claims, *inter alia*, “reading out attribute information of an upstream display panel having said panel ID ‘0’ by said host system; setting said panel ID of the upstream display panel having said panel ID ‘0’ to a value other than ‘0’ using a command for said display panel from which the attribute information is read out; by the display panel from which the attribute information is read out, inhibiting said command from the host system from being sent to a downstream display panel; and by the display panel from which the attribute information is read out, selecting one of the plurality of display panels connected to the downstream side to read out the attribute information to said host system.”

Furuhashi teaches a multi-display comprising a plurality of liquid crystal panels (see Figures 16 and 19). Furuhashi does not teach or suggest “by the display panel from which the attribute information is read out, selecting one of the plurality of display panels connected to the downstream side to read out the attribute information to said host system”, as claimed in claim 25. Furuhashi teaches a command is associated with an ID that “specifies one of the multi-display interfaces 101 to execute the command (see col. 7, lines 10-18).” The command is generated by a control unit. The control unit of Furuhashi is not a display panel as claimed in claim 25. Therefore, Furuhashi fails to teach or suggest, “by the display panel from which the attribute information is read out, selecting one of the plurality of display panels connected to the downstream side to read out the attribute information to said host system” as claimed in claim 25. Furuhashi fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 25.

Claims 26-29 depend from claim 25. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the independent claims. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1 to 29, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:  
**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889